

### **REMARKS**

Responsive to the Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, Applicant has studied the Examiner's comments and the cited art. Claims 55–88 are currently pending; after entry of this Amendment, claims 55–88 remain pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

#### **Amendments**

Claim 59 was amended to replace the reference to the “document server” with a reference to the “server.” The amendment does not change the scope of the claim.

Claim 71 was amended to replace “inspector document” with “inspector documents.” The amendment does not change the scope of the claim.

Entry of the amendments after final is proper, as the amendments adopt the Office Action's suggestions and do not require a new search.

#### **Claim Objections**

The Office Action objected to an informality in claim 71, which used “inspector document” in the singular instead of in the plural. Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Office Action and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

The Office Action rejected claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, because of a lack of antecedent basis for “the document server.” Applicant has amended the claim to reference “the server,” which is the way the Office Action interpreted the claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 55–88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,736. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Hanson fails to recite all of the elements of Applicant's claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action mischaracterizes the features of Hanson.

With respect to independent claims 55, 71, 77, and 85, the Office Action asserts that the Web document of Hanson corresponds to the inspector document of Applicant's claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action mischaracterizes the system of Hanson. One of skill in the art would not consider the Web document as “configurable to

describe the first attribute of the first application object,” even if the HTML command objects of Hanson can be considered a first application object, which Applicant does not admit.

The passage cited by the Office Action recites using the HTML editor system of Hanson to create the Web document.<sup>1</sup> Hanson recites HTML command objects that can be dragged into a collection of objects for use by the HTML editor. The objects in the collection of objects “may be edited by way of a context sensitive object editor to customize the Web document.”<sup>2</sup>

First, one skilled in the art would not consider the Web document as “associated with” the context sensitive object editor. Instead, the Web document is the output of the HTML editor system in which the context sensitive object editor executes.

Second, the HTML command object is used to customize the Web document, rather than the Web document configurable to describe attributes of the HTML command object. The HTML command object to be edited is selected and dragged to an object editor window where the object’s properties are displayed and may be modified.<sup>3</sup> Nothing in Hanson suggests that the Web document describes the properties of the object. Instead, a properties display panel 614 is opened by the object editor window, “via which a user is able to directly manipulate the properties associated with the object.”<sup>4</sup> Therefore the Web document would not be understood as being “configurable to describe the attributes” of the HTML object. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the HTML command objects of Hanson cannot be considered application objects as in Applicant’s claimed subject matter. Hanson recites the Web browser as “application software.” The HTML command objects of Hanson do not execute in the environment of the Web browser; rather, the Web browser application software is used to display the Web page created or modified by the HTML editor system of Hanson.<sup>5</sup> The Web browser application runs as a separate environment from the HTML editor system of Hanson, which at most communicates with the Web browser by interprocess communication to signal the Web browser to load a Web page saved by the HTML editor system.<sup>6</sup>

Dependent claims 56–70, 72–76, and 78–84, and 86–88 depend from allowable independent claims 55, 71, 77, and 85 and are therefore also allowable, for at least this reason.

Furthermore, with regards to claims 56 and 58, Hanson fails to recite more than one Web document being edited by the HTML editor system at the same time. Thus, even if a Web

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. 4, lines 26–28.

<sup>2</sup> Col. 4, lines 36–39.

<sup>3</sup> Col. 4, lines 36–39.

<sup>4</sup> Col. 11, lines 42–44.

<sup>5</sup> Col. 11, lines 35–54.

<sup>6</sup> Col. 11, lines 35–46.

document is considered an inspector document, which Applicant denies, the system of Hanson does not recite both a first inspector document and a second inspector document as in Applicant's claimed subject matter. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

With respect to claims 62 and 63, the passage cited by the Office Action for archiving the first application object as modified does not recite saving the HTML command objects. Instead, Hanson recites saving the web page that is generated by the collection of HTML command objects. Nothing in Hanson indicates that the HTML editor system is capable of saving or archiving the HTML objects as that function of these claims requires. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to claim 64, the Office Action asserts that the execution environment comprises a web browser. The HTML editor of Hanson, which the Office Action previously interpreted as an execution environment, is not recited as being a web browser or part of a web browser. Instead, as the passage cited by the Office Action makes clear, the HTML editor of Hanson saves a web page then signals the web browser to display that saved web page. The passage makes this distinction clear by pointing out that the invention of Hanson uses a "separate Web browser application software," which allows the HTML editor user to try out the web page with any Web browser.<sup>7</sup> For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to claim 66, the Office Action asserts Hanson discloses "wherein the communication between the first inspector object and the first application object modifies the first attribute to be conditionally dependent on a characteristics [sic] of the execution environment (col. 10, lines 35-54)." This mischaracterizes Hanson. The cited passage nowhere recites a first application object (according to the Office Action, an HTML command object) executing any other execution environment. Rather, the cited passage merely describes the user viewing the web page in "any Web browser."<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, even that passage fails to recite any conditional modification of an attribute of one of the objects manipulated by the context sensitive editor of Hanson. For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 87, Hanson fails to recite an inspector document, where the server discovers attributes of the first application object and configures the inspector document to describe a first attribute of the attributes of the first application object discovered by the server, where the inspector object uses the inspector document to selectively modify the first attribute. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

---

<sup>7</sup> Col. 10, lines 48-51.

<sup>8</sup> Col. 10, lines 48-51.

Similarly, with respect to claim 88, Hanson fails to recite an inspector document that is preconfigured to describe a first attribute of the first application object, where the inspector document is configured to use the inspector document to selectively modify the first attribute. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all issues and rejections have been adequately addressed, that all claims are allowable, and that the case should be advanced to issuance.

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to discuss the claims, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Richard A. Schafer/  
Richard A. Schafer, Reg. No. 45,078

Date: April 10, 2006

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP  
1111 Louisiana Street, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002-5200  
Telephone: (713) 220-5800  
Facsimile: (713) 236-0822